

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

CHARLES WILLIAMS,	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:01-CV-2345
	:	
Plaintiff	:	(Judge Conner)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
COMMONWEALTH OF	:	
PENNSYLVANIA, DEPARTMENT OF	:	
CORRECTIONS, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 17th day of November, 2005, upon consideration of plaintiff's motion (Doc. 91) to issue subpoenas for four former defendants¹ to attend trial in this case, and it appearing that all claims against these former defendants were dismissed (see Doc. 38), that plaintiff intends to call these former defendants to testify only to their own alleged wrongs (see Doc. 91 ¶¶ 1-4), that plaintiff's only remaining claims are against defendant Norris B. Webb arising out of plaintiff's first grievance, ROC-0404-99 (see Doc. 83, Attach. 1 at 7-9), see Williams v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, No. 03-3534, 2005 WL 1950801, at *4 (3d Cir. Aug. 16, 2005), and that plaintiff does not aver that these former defendants have

¹ Vincent Kushwara, Robert Meyers, Robert Bitner, and Gregory Gaertner.

personal knowledge of the alleged actions of defendant Webb with respect to the first grievance,² it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The motion (Doc. 91) is DENIED without prejudice.
2. Plaintiff shall be permitted to file, on or before December 2, 2005, a detailed statement of facts to which the former defendants will testify regarding their *personal knowledge* of the alleged actions of defendant Webb with respect to the first grievance.

S/ Christopher C. Conner
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER
United States District Judge

² In a prior order of court, plaintiff was directed to give a detailed statement of the facts to which the proposed witnesses would testify. (See Doc. 84 ¶ 3.) Plaintiff does not give a detailed statement, but indicates only that all four witnesses will testify “about the fact that they had knowledge that [defendant] had gotten injured.” (Doc. 91 at 1.) Such knowledge, however, appears to have been acquired *after* the alleged actions of defendant Webb and, hence, is irrelevant to the disposition of this case.